

## SECRET

. . . . The 69th meeting of the CIA CAREER COUNCIL convened at 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, 1 February 1962, in the Office of Personnel Conference Room, 5E62 Headquarters Building, with the following present:

	Emmett D. Echols, Chairman
25X1A9a	[REDACTED] for the DD/P, Member
	[REDACTED] he DTR, Member
	[REDACTED] the IG, Member
	[REDACTED] for the DD/I, Member
	Lawrence K. White, Member
25X1A9a	[REDACTED], Executive Secretary
	[REDACTED] Recording Secretary

. . . . The minutes of the 68th meeting of the CIA CAREER COUNCIL were approved as presented . . . .

CHAIRMAN: The first item is an item which was brought up at the last meeting, wherein a policy was recommended to the Director to give up to 12 months <sup>grace</sup> to persons who were approaching eligibility for annuities upon separation, either a voluntary annuity or a discontinued service annuity, provided the services of the individual could be constructively used during that period. This policy was approved by the Director. We are now coming back with a recommendation that the policy be changed to make the period of permissible delay cover up to 24 months; in other words, if an individual is within 24 months of eligibility for either a voluntary annuity or a discontinued service annuity, and again if the individual can be profitably used by the Agency during that period, we would, as a matter of policy, carry him until he had attained eligibility.

25X1A9a MR [REDACTED] "Profitably used" would mean even if you had to use him in a normally lower slot capacity, or continue using him profitably at the same grade level?

CHAIRMAN: I certainly wouldn't want to go on record that we were going to keep a person on the Government payroll at the same salary in a lower grade, but I think this would be perfectly proper because this would be consistent with <sup>salary</sup> the retention of a person after downgrading -- I <sup>of salary which may be withdrawn</sup> think it morally is consistent. I think <sup>for</sup> as a practical matter, yes, but I don't think we want to publicize it as such.

I think our paper presents a precedent for this retention, gives greater recognition to the importance of 18 years minimum of Government

## SECRET

**SECRET**

service, establishes to a greater extent you might say the moral obligation of the Government -- not a legal obligation -- and there is precedent in the Armed Services' reserve programs and in the Foreign Service programs.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I'm for it.

COLONEL WHITE: Well, I'm for it but I'd like to speak to it for a minute. When this first came up and Emmett and I discussed it we started out with the concept of adopting a 24-month rule to be consistent with the military services, etc., and this was studied by others, and we came to the Career Council with the 12-month proposal, and it was explained to me that the argument for the 12-month proposal was that this would get our exercise over with faster and not drag it out, etc. -- so we adopted the 12-month proposal. Now a case brought this reconsideration about, and that was the case of an individual up for separation who would be eligible in 18 months but not in 12 months. This case was considered by a Board which had nothing to do with this, but this Board was, I understand, shocked, and felt strongly that something should be done for this particular fellow so that we could keep him on for 18 months -- and I shared the Board's feeling about this. So Emmett came to me to talk about the various ways that we might do this, and I said: No, let's don't resort to any gimmicks -- if we want to go back and change the policy, let's change the policy.

Now the reason I wanted to speak to this is that the case is going to come up right away where a fellow has 24 months and one day, or 25 months, etc., and I think it's important that we agree, if we do agree on this policy, that it's a hard and fast policy, and if the fellow misses it by one month or one day it's just too bad.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] And it's not retroactive? Because we have one now where the man is asking for 13 months, and the question is if this is retroactive will it catch a fellow like that?

CHAIRMAN: What is the name of the individual?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]

25X1A9a

CHAIRMAN: This is a case at hand. If this policy were approved we would bring this case to your [indicating Colonel White] attention -- he is the only one -- and you would have to make a decision as to whether or not you can profitably use this man for an additional period so as to make

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

him eligible under this policy.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] We may have one for about a year--

25X1A9a

COLONEL WHITE: I think if we are going to change the policy -- I think it's very fortunate that we haven't acted on those.

25X1A9a

CHAIRMAN: We have about seven days to move in on the [REDACTED] case.

MR. [REDACTED] As I understand, as he told me, he refuses to be considered for a GS-13 slot. And this raises the question of what is profitable employment? It seems to me that a fellow like that should, in exchange for our carrying him, be willing to just help out wherever he can -- anything within reason.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] The grade assigned to a particular position in the Clandestine Services has progressively over the years lost more and more significance. And I think in any Career Service this is all to the good. I don't believe that anybody worries too much in the Armed Forces if you put a Colonel or a Lieutenant Colonel in a particular job, or a Major or a Lieutenant Colonel. In very much the same way we have to use people where they are needed, and this is especially true in positions whose importance varies with the work that has to be done in the field. So I would think that it's pretty academic in our Service whether a man who is a 14 is put in a 13 job or not. You know, this feeling that persisted for some time that this meant that he wasn't up to doing a 14's job I think is rapidly disappearing.

COLONEL WHITE: I couldn't agree more.

25X1A9a

CHAIRMAN: Would this man be eligible in 13 months for a discontinued service annuity or a voluntary annuity?

MR. [REDACTED] A discontinued service annuity.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] What he is after is age, not service.

CHAIRMAN: If this policy were approved, and if Colonel White feels that he can profitably use this man during this 13-month period, he would remain on the exercise, the Director would determine to separate him, but we would set the separation date so as to permit him to attain this eligibility. That is how this would work. But you [indicating Colonel White] would still have a decision to make.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I don't know that this is of interest, but I'll

**SECRET**

## SECRET

take a chance on it. As of this date the situation in the Clandestine Services is about as follows. On 1 January of this year we had twelve people who were eligible for a discontinued annuity. We will have during this year - 1962 - thirteen become eligible for a discontinued annuity. During 1963, if we extend this to 24 months, we would have nine more. I should very much like to see it extended to 24 months so that these nine people who otherwise would be separated without any annuity would attain eligibility.

CHAIRMAN: These are people who may be part of your current [REDACTED] exercise?

25X1A

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] They are.

COLONEL WHITE: I'm with you. I just thought that we ought to agree that once we make the policy--

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Yes -- you have to cut it off somewhere.

COLONEL WHITE: And you can't resort to any special deals to take care of this fellow or that fellow.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] So far as optional is concerned, on 1 January 1962 we had nine people who are below the line in the [REDACTED] exercise who are 25X1A eligible for optional retirement. During this year we would have only one who would become eligible. And during 1963, provided we extend this grace period to 24 months, we would have three more. So twelve people in the Clandestine Services are affected by this.

CHAIRMAN: Any other discussion? [No response.]

Is there a motion from someone?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I move that we change this to 24 months.

CHAIRMAN: Any objection? [No response.] So be it.

The next item on our agenda is strictly an informational item, but I found it very, very interesting, and I thought the Council might be interested in it. It concerns a rather informal report issued by the Executive Secretary of the Agency Retirement Board, and I thought its very informal nature, as a matter of fact, made it more meaningful and gave a clearer picture of what is actually happening here -- and I am personally tremendously impressed at the way this is moving people along with a minimum amount of rancor and a maximum amount of thoughtful consideration. The policy is undoubtedly being very effective in opening up positions and moving

SECRET

**SECRET**

our people along. At the same time, it protects operating components that have exceptionally valuable people in these age brackets.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] This thing is unique in that as it proceeds it makes things less difficult. This is contrary to life as it exists today -- almost everything gets tougher the longer you live! In this instance when people have a longer forewarning that this is going to take place there is not going to be anything difficult about it at all -- everybody is going to accept it as a perfectly normal procedure. Some of the people who were hit quite suddenly by this felt that it was difficult because it made them change plans which in some instances were in being a long time.

CHAIRMAN: I think the report indicates there is only one person to date who has flatly refused to have anything to do with this program, and I believe he happens to be -- and it is essentially coincidental -- happens to be part of a current [REDACTED] exercise that has come as far as my Office, so I knew about this, and he ranked very, very low on the relative retention list, so no doubt will be separated. This individual very possibly will go out and allege that we have used another method of getting rid of him, but it simply is not provable in any way -- in fact, all of the evidence indicates that regardless of age he would have been caught in this [REDACTED] exercise.

25X1A

25X1A

Any other comments on this item? [No response.]

The third item on the agenda is our proposed revision of the Fitness Reporting form and system. The recommendations which we make here have been based upon what I think is a very thoughtful statistical analysis which I think strongly supports the recommendations we are making. I think the statistical analysis also gives us some factual information which sustains our belief that our present reporting system is in fact quite effective and well thought of in the Agency, and I think it should put to bed some suspicions that have been expressed from time to time that the DD/P rates higher than the DD/S or the DD/S rates higher than the DD/I, and so on.

I have been so impressed by these statistics that I'd like to point out some of them to you. The thing that interested me most -- and I can illustrate this same point again -- can be seen very easily in Tab B-1,

**SECRET**

SECRET

25X9A2 which is an analysis made of some [REDACTED] Fitness Reports prepared, I believe, primarily during the year 1960, and in this particular tabulation here rates the first three specific duties as they are shown on Fitness Reports. We have a similar statistical analysis of over-all performance, and similar analyses of the <sup>other</sup> rating sections of our present fitness reporting form. But one of the striking things here is the similarity of the rating application of the DD/I, DD/P, and DD/S. You will note, for example, in top ratings - No. 7 on the scale - for the rating of the performance of specific duties that percentagewise the DD/I and DD/P are identical, and the DD/S is a shade less - 1% less; and at the No. 6 scale the DD/I and DD/P are identical at 28%, and the DD/S is considerably less - 19% less; at the 5 level the DD/I is 46%, the DD/P is 43%, and the DD/S 40% -- at this point they are a little closer together; at the 4 level we find the DD/I is 20%, the DD/P 22%, and the DD/S 30%. Now from here on down we find conclusive evidence that there is very little utilization and very little purpose served in ranking degrees of badness. In other words, if a person is weak - so weak that you're going to rate him down here, you're going to do something about him. What you are going to do will vary -- but there is little purpose served in ranking degree of badness, and supervisors don't care to do it. In fact, out of all these thousands of reports nobody used the 1 level of duty performance, almost nobody used the 2 level, and a very low percentage used the 3 range of rating. I point this out specifically at this time because in our new scale we only have one level of ranking called "weak", which is below satisfactory, and in every case where we - the Office of Personnel - receive a Fitness Report with a weak rating in over-all performance or multiple weak ratings in duties we will always get together with the operating component concerned to see what if anything should be done about this. Any rating in this category in a single duty or several duties, or particularly in over-all performance, requires action - whether it's selection out or whether it's additional training, or encouragement - whatever it may be -- it does require action. And this is what we have tried to do in our new scale. We feel the supervisors will be less reluctant to use a ranking of below satisfactory if they don't have to be precise about it. And I think

SECRET

**SECRET**

psychologically this is also a good thing. I have my own interpretation as to why the DD/S rankings are generally lower in the upper levels than those in the DD/I and DD/P, and that is there are other tabulations here which show quite conclusively that the higher the grade occupied the higher the ranking, generally speaking, and this is logical for the type of people who have the mentality and the education and ability to rise to upper grade levels will by and large turn in a higher level of performance. And the DD/S I believe has a greater proportion of lower graded people than the other components and this probably tends to pull down his over-all rankings in bulk numbers. There may be other factors, of course, apart from this. But I think this does prove that without consistency of standards other than those that are inherent in our present adjectival ratings, and so on, and recognizing these things are being applied by thousands of supervisors, there is startling similarity of interpretation, apparently, of the standards and of the application.

Do you want to go through these specific changes that we are proposing here, one by one, and discuss them, or do you each individually have specific points you would like to get on the record? It can be done either way.

On page 2 of our presentation here in the left-hand column we have the problems that we have isolated by the analysis of criticisms of many, many people, or that are inherent in our statistical analyses of the fitness reporting system as it has been planned. In the right-hand column are the solutions which we have proposed and have incorporated in the new fitness reporting form. I think I have already touched largely on the No. 1 problem here. In the past we have had multiple scales for rating various parts of performance. We had a 7-point scale, a 6-point scale, and a 5-point scale in parts of the old form. This was done deliberately by the initial planners of the scale as an attempt, if you will, to outwit the raters, to prevent them from falling into the fallacies of first rating duties and then casually averaging these duties for over-all performance. We all know that in over-all performance one does take into consideration and should take into consideration characteristics and so on that are not

**SECRET**

SECRET

specifically pinpointed in performance of duties, and so a person shouldn't casually average his ratings of duty performance in coming up with an over-all performance rating. So the original planners tried to outwit them by using a different scale - different adjectives, and I think this has resulted in a general resentment against the program, criticism of it, etc. We have licked this this time by completely abolishing <sup>The</sup> ~~a~~ scale ~~and~~ using a simple adjectival system, for the simple reason that no two people interpret a single one word adjective the same as the next person. So we have tried to give the same adjective, perhaps, but with, I hope, a precise definition of that adjective which will at least minimize this business of varied interpretation of the meaning of a word. Secondly, we have changed from a number system to a letter system, which will make far more difficult a tendency to try to average things out. And then by using the same scale for each of our two formal rating systems we obviate the need to perfect ourselves in the use of three different scales, and a common terminology and, we hope, more uniformity in application.

Are there any real objections, or criticisms or suggestions, on the rating scales that we have now used? I think Tab B-6 has our new scale, and I have made at least one editorial change since this came out.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] There was a correction sent out.

CHAIRMAN: There was a further correction that I think came from Dan. He points out in the definition of "strong" that the first few words - "This rating signifies that" -- this is excessive wordage. We could just say: Strong - The duties are performed with remarkable proficiency.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Start with "Performance of duties" -- have them parallel.

25X1A9a

CHAIRMAN: All right - "performance of duties".

MR. [REDACTED] I think everyone here is sufficiently familiar with the forms we have used in the past and this form that is now proposed, which I think is a pretty apparent improvement. Why not just start off with this new form and let us comment on things as we go along. I believe there may be certain points that some of us wish to make, and whether they are accepted or not I believe it is worthwhile to hear them.

SECRET



**SECRET**

CHAIRMAN: All right.

The Form and its instruction, of course, are the essence of the system, so going to the Form - we have thrown in in Section 9 additional material which reflects our new categories of personnel system. It will permit us whenever we use these forms to identify a reservist from a temporary employee and a career conditional employee from a career employee. This should be very useful. Are there any criticisms or comments on that item? [No response.]

On Section B -- which is the most important section, of course -- is a single scale for evaluations. I would point out two things. If you analyzed this scale you would find there are two basic bench marks in it. "Satisfactory" is clearly a bench mark, and it's characterized by neither deficiency nor excellence. You will note that below that is "weak" - which is clearly less than satisfactory, but "satisfactory" is the bench mark. Moving upward to "proficient" - you will find the first definition, "Performance is more than satisfactory", again using the bench mark of "satisfactory" for the middle range above it and below it. Then we introduce our next bench mark - "Desired results are being produced in a proficient manner" - "proficient" is the new bench mark that comes in at this point. Going up to "strong" -- "with remarkable proficiency" is a higher degree. Now our last rating - "outstanding" - has an interesting thought in it -- "Performance is so exceptional in relation to requirements of the work and in comparison with others doing similar work as to warrant special recognition." Now we hope that using this language and by bringing into this level of rating a comparison to the performance of others that this will be a deterrent to the casual and unwarranted use of this top level of ranking and will really lead to its use for only those people who stand out among others and who are worthy of special recognition. This is just a psychological hope, perhaps, or gimmick, and it may or may not prove to be successful. We hope it will be a deterrent to the use of this upper level of performance rating. But I'm not truly worried about this because as our statistical tabulation showed the percentage of people who were rated in the top level even under the old system was only 3% - but I think logically 3% -- maybe it's a high percentage, even - maybe it should be 1%.

**SECRET**

## SECRET

Are there any comments on the evaluation scales that we have proposed?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] One unanimous criticism of all of our people on this was the single adjective for below the average -- it was, as I said, absolutely unanimous -- and a feeling that because there is only the one word that people are hence going to be afraid to use it and are going to push people up unnecessarily -- that by calling a man "weak", that by definition, then, he can be considered barely less than satisfactory or a total wash-out, that in a sense you are lumping these guys all together - the guy that should be fired tomorrow and the guy that ought to go and have some training.

CHAIRMAN: We are lumping them all together purposely, hoping there will be anonymity within the broad range and that the corrective action will indicate to the individual how weak he is.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I understand your thought behind this.

COLONEL WHITE: In our Staff Meeting, also, this came up in connection with the old form and everybody found fault with this adjective at that time -- everybody was pushing for an unsatisfactory rating which you give somebody if you really want to get rid of him. But I thought the new definition of "weak" here really took care of the points that our office heads raised.

CHAIRMAN: I would raise this point, too, that our office heads did not have the benefit of this statistical study.

COLONEL WHITE: Even so, the old performance rating permitted "weak" to go up to include barely satisfactory. Your new definition makes it clear that if you are weak you are inadequate, and this rating requires corrective action. I think it's all right.

CHAIRMAN: Statistically we can show that people didn't use "unsatisfactory" when they had it, so now when people say, "Give it to us" - we say: "Why give it to you? You don't use it anyway."

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Your narrative section would show whether the person just needed training.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] This I think is the answer to the criticism --

SECRET

## SECRET

you say this calls for remedial action. I think somewhere we should indicate what that action is, and that would cover your [ indicating Mr.

25X1A9a [ point -- if somewhere in this Report you have to say what this remedial action is, and then we can either separate for cause, give further training, or have a talk with him and admonish him. This would indicate the degree of his weakness.

CHAIRMAN: This is part of the definition -- it says this rating requires remedial action.

COLONEL WHITE: I think you have a very good point there, though. What Dan is saying, as I understand it, is that if you rate this man "weak" then somewhere in this Report -- and you have recognized by doing that that remedial action is necessary -- then somewhere in the Report you should say what you are going to do -- which I think is a very good point.

25X1A9a MR. [ I think we should say right here that this will be done under such and such a Section.

25X1A9a MR. [ Say "this requires such and such" -- that means you say what the action is.

COLONEL WHITE: I think that is a good point.

CHAIRMAN: Could we say: This rating requires description of corrective action or remedial action in Section C.

25X1A9a MR. [ That is all right with me, as long as this is covered specifically. Then you don't have to have this broken down into three or four degrees, you can simply show by the action taken--

COLONEL WHITE: You could add right there that use of this rating requires description of proposed remedial action in Section C. I think it's an excellent point.

CHAIRMAN: Does everybody like that? Okay.

25X1A9a MR. [ With your permission, I will continue. This is editorial, but it seems to me it's much better English under "adequate" to say it "... is characterized neither by deficiency nor by excellence" -- Neither and nor.

25X1A9a MR. [ I support the suggestion.

25X1A9a MR. [ And then I have the same point under "strong" -

## SECRET

an editorial suggestion on making that definition parallel with the others by starting out with "Performance of duties..." And I would also like to throw out that the word "remarkable" is, I think, not a good word -- it's not a tight word.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: "Exceptional" is the word.

COLONEL WHITE: I choked on that, too, and got out the dictionary, 25X1A9a looked it up, swallowed hard, and decided to keep quiet.

MR. [REDACTED] The word means different things to different people, but I don't think it's a good, tight word for this sort of thing. I think "exceptional" is good, if you want to go that far.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Or "unusual". "Exceptional" I would say is the better word.

25X1A9a COLONEL WHITE: I like "exceptional".

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] So do I. That is what I suggest.

MR. [REDACTED] Using "exceptional" here it might throw you off a little if you put it next to the next one, which begins: "Performance is so exceptional...."

25X1A9a CHAIRMAN: No -- there is some continuity.

MR. [REDACTED] I think that is pretty good.

25X1A9a CHAIRMAN: I think it is good to establish bench marks, and using the same word insofar as possible.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Yes, that is all right.

MR. [REDACTED]: May I start with a rather fundamental question? Let me say, to begin with, that I feel that these very enlightening statistics which are given in connection with Fitness Reports and their ratings produced little joy in me. I think it shows very clearly that people by and large are over-rated. What do you mean by "average" and what do you mean by "above average"? Do you mean when you say people are "average" that taking all of the officers in a particular grade group or in a particular function - a case officer, for example - that you are comparing one with the other?--which is a pretty good way to do it. If that is the case obviously you can't have a majority of the people above average, because "average" is just what the word says - it's the average performance in that grade group or in that function. If, on the other hand, you have some

SECRET

**SECRET**

theoretical standard in mind -- the United States Government, humanity, or United States citizens, and you're saying that the people in the Clandestine Services are above average as far as the citizenry of the United States is concerned, this is something quite different, and it seems to me a very unrealistic basis on which to rate people.

I remember, Red, and this was before your time, that they had a very simple Fitness Report in the Army. It's been changed, I'm sure, many, many times since, but it was before the head shrinkers got hold of it, before anybody really became aware of the psychological principles involved in all this. It started off by saying: You are rating this officer in comparison with his colleagues, associates, etc. Among the officers in any group within the Army about 80% of them are average, 10% of them are above average, and 10% of them are below average. Well, this pretty darn well established a standard that "average" means "average", and you are not getting this totally artificial rating in which the majority of your people are above average. Above average? -- what is average? -- that is my point. And I find that in connection with Regulation [REDACTED] that changes the rule -- that is, [REDACTED] -- that one of our greatest difficulties is to reconcile the separation of an individual who looks like a near genius.

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A9a

COLONEL WHITE: Yes -- absolutely.

MR. [REDACTED] And it wouldn't be nearly as difficult for me, although you accept the principle these people are not substandard and you're not separating them because they are substandard but you are separating them because you don't need them, but nonetheless, I would separate them with a great deal better conscience or feeling about it if they weren't rated superior.

CHAIRMAN: I certainly agree with what you say, Dan, but if you look at our configuration here and accept your formula that 10% are unsatisfactory, 80% are in the middle, 10% are on top -- you will find the same configuration here, only we have 3% on top, roughly 3% on the bottom, and 84% in categories 4, 5, and 6. That is not dissimilar to what you said.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] 5 is excellent, 4 - competent - is considerably less, and 3 - acceptable - is less still.

**SECRET**

SECRET

Emmett, I really don't want to make a nuisance of myself on this but I am convinced that people in the Clandestine Services as a general rule are over-rated.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, I agree, and also in the DD/I and DD/S.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I speak only for the ones with which I am familiar. And I think what we want to do -- and you know I have pressed now for a very long time to get some definitions of what we mean, so as to avoid these totally inconsistent practices of having one Division say: "These people are rated according to tight standards" -- this is an absurdity, and it defeats the very purpose of rankings and ratings in a Service to have a standard different in one component from that in another, and something we can't continue. I believe that we would be well advised to have under Section B "weak", with the requirement that I just suggested, then "adequate", and I would cut out "proficient" and strengthen, then, "adequate" -- meaning that if a man is adequate he is what the word means, that he is in fact satisfactory in all respects -- that is what it means. Then if you're going to say, "Well, what is above adequate?" -- then I would say "strong" -- this man is exceptionally adequate, he is exceptionally proficient, and then here is a real genius - this fellow has a degree of exceptional capacity so outstanding that he must be considered almost in a class by himself. I think that the 1, 2, 3 and 4 is all we really need, and it would tend to get more people into the bracket where they belonged, and that is "adequate", if we're talking about comparing people with their associates or all the people that are in this category or group.

CHAIRMAN: May I speak to that, Dan? In my opinion, listening to your points I recognized immediately you really have two points here. One, you are basically offended because you know from past experience that more people are rated "superior" than is factually the case, and not enough people are just rated "average".

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Right.

CHAIRMAN: Now I have read many, many, many - scientific and otherwise - treatises on this subject of Fitness Report rating, and this is the common problem. Everybody would like to have absolute reality and realism come into these rating systems, but the psychologists say this: that

SECRET

**SECRET**

at best this is an exercise involving two people, the supervisor and the subordinate. It is human nature, they say, to try basically to get along in your immediate work relationships, and for this reason you can't lick it, is their conclusion, you can't prevent these supervisors from generally over-rating their subordinates -- nor do they conclude that this is undesirable. Just face up to the fact that this is a normal, natural, psychological fact, and accept it - don't fight it. So this is why I say to your one point that you and I were all offended, and from a theoretical point of view we would say, "By God, this isn't true -- this is bad" -- but they say this is not bad, this in fact recognizes the predominant desire to get along in your immediate work relationships -- flatter your subordinate a bit. So if this happens uniformly in any system without great exaggeration, I see nothing wrong with it.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] To what degree do you pamper this altruism, this fine feeling toward our fellow man? If it's good to a certain degree it might be good to rate everybody "superior" unless he is ready to be kicked out. Where do you stop? I think we ought to accept the English language pretty much as it has universal application, and if you say a man is "adequate" - it means that he is adequate -- and not have a feeling that has certainly grown up in the Clandestine Services that if you look at a man's file and he is marked 4 -- which is, I think, the currently adequate -- they say, "Well, he certainly didn't do very well. This fellow hasn't done very well." Unless he has a 5, which I think in all respects is superior, he is really considered a dud. We murder the English language in many bureaucratic ways, but this is really going beyond the call of duty, it seems to me.

CHAIRMAN: Now let me speak to your second point, and relate the two. We have here four levels of ratings which are satisfactory or better. You are suggesting we only have three levels of ratings. Now I might add that the A&E Staff in a three page memorandum to me recommended that we have nine levels of ratings.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I'm not at all surprised -- and this is an extremely good argument in my behalf. This is exactly what I started off

**SECRET**

SECRET

by saying. You couldn't have supplied a more convincing argument for this thing.

CHAIRMAN: If you concede my original premise that it is human nature to think first about what is the impact of the rating I'm going to give this man upon my day-to-day work relationships with him, with four levels of rating above satisfactory or better you can flatter a man a little bit by going to a shade higher ranking without gross misrepresentation, whereas if you only have three ratings or two ratings above this, rather than give him this very accurate ranking you are forced to jump way up to a higher and more exaggerated ranking. Well, somewhere there is a compromise in here -- somewhere between one, two, three, or nine is the answer -- I don't know where it is.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I'm inclined to agree with you, Emmett, that if you abolish the ranking of "proficient" and say nothing more about the adequacy of "adequate" you are very apt to have the majority of the people in the Clandestine Services rated strong.

COLONEL WHITE: I agree.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I'm not willing to concede they are strong, comparatively. I therefore would reinforce adequate by saying: This blinking well means what it says - the man is satisfactory in every respect. And 80% of the people who are performing similar functions to the man rated would be so rated or so graded. If we can get down to something of that sort we are then encouraging people to be realistic and not allowing them simply to go along in this never-never land which leads to many difficulties in management.

CHAIRMAN: I have one more argument against you, Dan, and that is, as you yourself point out, the Armed Services for years have attempted to compress rankings within a pre-outlined picture of their gross manpower -- and I have a military form right here -- even by drawing little figures.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] That is the modern one -- heavens! - don't even mention it! I had to rate a soldier recently, and I thought: "Gosh, I really am being extremely liberal with this fellow" -- but it came back and what it said was: you can't do this - that unless a man is rated superior

SECRET



**SECRET**

they are very apt to put him in what used to be called Class B. Now I submit that this is an absurdity.

CHAIRMAN: I submit that organizations that have tried your system of compressing within a pre-determined pattern have never been successful in it. In fact, we have the proof today that the grossest exaggeration of ratings occurs in the Services that attempt to compress within a pattern their ratings.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Well, I have said my piece, and if this stays the way it is I can assure you that I am going to recommend to the Deputy Director of Plans that we put out some instructions in the Clandestine Services which will attempt to accomplish what I have just said, which I think we should accomplish in the definition of what these things mean. As it is now the Fitness Reports in the Clandestine Services, except when they point out specific weaknesses and specific strengths in the narrative, are practically without value, really.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I think one of the difficulties is, as Mr. [REDACTED] 25X1A9a points out, some Divisions have attempted to set up their own private standards. In fact, I know of one Division which has a rubber stamp which they hit this Report with. I think this is undesirable. I think they all should work on the same system, and, by extension of this, I would hate to see a component put out its own separate instructions for how to fill out a Fitness Report. It seems to me we ought to agree on one set of instructions to cover the Agency. Because what happens in that particular Division is they rate a man 3 and then to sort of salve their conscience they hit this thing with the rubber stamp, so that they are implying that by hitting it with the rubber stamp they are giving him honestly a 3 but this means 5.

CHAIRMAN: We have recently abolished the rubber stamps.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] That is true, and I'm strongly in favor of that, but may I add that these Divisions although they were certainly out of line in sort of establishing their own standards they did attempt to define these ratings in a fashion which people could understand. For example, when they said a man was adequate rather than satisfactory they attempted by the use of language to indicate this is what it meant, and

**SECRET**

## SECRET

therefore they were encouraging more people--

CHAIRMAN: The language, though -- the command language was directive: By God you WILL apply the normal meaning of the English word.

COLONEL WHITE: As Dan says, they were properly motivated, but by so doing they threw all the basis of comparison out. And it was not confined to the Clandestine Services -- we had two or three offices doing it.

Emmett, I subscribe to Dan's philosophy but think that to try to put it into effect literally might be wrong, because I suspect that with some of the spineless raters and reviewers that we have, rather than put them in the category that they belonged, and not having an intermediate category, would go all the way to the top. And I doubt if it's humanly possible at this stage of the game -- I mean, you and I would do it, sure, but there are a few thousand other people that have to do it, and I'm afraid the net result would be they would all go up to strong and that we really would not come as close to accomplishing our objective as we would if we left this intermediate rating in there.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I have another suggestion to make, Red, that I think would really assist in this, and that is to remove the directive that the rated person must see his Fitness Report -- except when there is a derogatory comment in it. I think this would do more to assist in having the rater rate the man realistically. As it is now when you have to show the Fitness Report willy-nilly to the individual whether it's good, bad, or indifferent -- if it's a good Fitness Report anyway the inclination is: Well, I'll flatter him a little bit - this will improve his morale, he may therefore put out a little bit more in his effort. And all of this sort of results in a ring-around-the-rosy where everybody is happy and everybody feels that we are just getting along splendidly here together. I believe wholeheartedly that when anybody makes a derogatory comment about an individual in an official record that individual must have the right to rebut it and respond to it. I would have no objection to having in the Fitness Report a statement that within the last month I have talked with this individual about his performance and I have expressed to him verbally very much the opinion of his performance that is expressed in here [Fitness Report]. But

SECRET

**SECRET**

I think to have a man have the legal right, so to speak, to come in and see his Fitness Report, and really to protest it if you don't indicate that he is well above the average, just gets you nowhere, and it makes these weak supervisors run this thing up to very unrealistic heights indeed.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] This would in a sense rob the man of one defense against separation -- not under [REDACTED]

25X1A CHAIRMAN: That is certainly a valid point, but my main position is this, Dan --

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] being the regulation having to do with separation. But I'm saying he must see it if there is anything derogatory. Are you going to separate people without saying anything derogatory about them?

25X1A9a CHAIRMAN: Yes indeed.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] If a man is being separated out he has a right to know what his Fitness Reports have been.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I would have no objection to a man being granted the right to see all his Fitness Reports at one time. But I say this business in connection with the preparation of the Fitness Report of having a place here for the man to sort of agree to this--

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] But a man has the right to know whether he is good or outstanding. Under your system he won't know that.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] But he could at the proper time ask to see all his Fitness Reports.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Then why shouldn't the supervisor face up to his yearly responsibility of keeping his employees knowledgeable of what he thinks of them. This to me is a basic management requirement. And lots of supervisors do fail -- that is human nature -- but the right of the employee to know what his Boss thinks of him is essential.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] It logically leads into a discussion of his work performance if they talk it over.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I think the morale would be terrible--

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] What happens usually is that the Chief certainly of a Division gives it to his secretary and says: Here -- get so and so in

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

and show him his Fitness Report.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] If I ever heard of such a thing going on I would raise hell.

CHAIRMAN: I have two points, and I think what I'm about to say overrides any objections to the system. We use these Fitness Reports -- and every merit system does -- for competitive promotions, for assignment of people, we use them for selection out cases, and we are going to use them in our reduction exercises for the preparation of relative retention registers. I think any individual against whom an adverse action is taken could take his case to court and say: I was never shown my Fitness Reports -- I was never told my performance was weak here, and weak here, and weak here.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] You are fudging on me now, my friend. I said that everybody who was rated "weak" had to see it. You just used that adjective [weak] just now.

CHAIRMAN: There are relative degrees of weakness, Dan.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Anybody who is rated weak in anything would have to see his Fitness Report at the time that it was made out so he could attach a rebuttal. I have religiously observed this principle in the Clandestine Services. And I have no quarrel with the man having the right to come to a selected place, ask for his Fitness Reports, and see them. But I think it's this sort of bureaucratic process to which we go now, in which a man makes out this Fitness Report and then shows the thing to the individual so that he can come in and say: "Well, I think you say I'm just average here, and I think I'm above average." Well, where does this end? Usually to get rid of him the rater will say: "All right, we will make it above average."

COLONEL WHITE: Well, Dan, I sure agree with your first point, and that is that the Fitness Reports would be a lot more honest, there is no doubt about that. When I was in the military service I never saw any Fitness Report made out on me, and it never occurred to me that I should see them, until after I was retired, and I went over to the Pentagon and asked to see them, and they were far better than I deserved or had any right to expect, but there was one in there that made my blood boil, because I remembered him

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

so well -- and, fortunately, I had only served under this man for about three months -- but he was a Captain and I was a 2nd Lieutenant -- and he had called me in and had told me that he thought I was doing a good job. But his concept was, as was the case in many instances in those days, that a 2nd Lieutenant is just satisfactory - how can he be anything more than satisfactory? Well, had I still been in the Service and had Captain X still been in the Service, I wouldn't have liked that -- I would have been mad about it and I would have probably done a lot of talking about it -- because he didn't come clean with me -- he told me I was doing fine.

Now in an organization like ours where you don't have people moving in and out, you have long continuity, I really feel that in 1962 there would be a constant stream of people asking to see their Fitness Reports, and in the end everybody would become suspect of everybody else, and we would damage morale. So as painful as it is -- and I have done my share of this -- I believe the supervisor has got to be trained to accept that responsibility and level with the man across the desk from him. This is to my mind one of the greatest weaknesses in the Agency today at all levels - the inability of supervisors to sit down across the table from their subordinates and be honest with them about how they are doing. And it seems to me if we went the other way on this that no doubt Fitness Reports would be a lot more honest but there are other things that in my judgment would outweigh it.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] If the latter had been done well I would agree, but I think that the occasion on which a supervisor sits down in a relaxed and deliberate fashion and goes over with his subordinate how he is doing, exactly what he is doing, and so on -- I think this needs improvement here. I think this is an excellent thing in theory, Red, but honestly I doubt if very many busy people do that.

COLONEL WHITE: I know you are right, Dan, but I think it's something we have to keep driving at.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Have we skipped over from Section C to Section D?  
We are talking now about showing it to individuals.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I brought this in out of sequence because it had to do with trying to make it easier for supervisors to rate realistically rather than in somewhat inflated terms.

**SECRET**

CHAIRMAN: We are still on Section B.

COLONEL WHITE: Could I ask Dan a question? I sure agree with Dan that the instructions to go along with this -- defining what these adjectives mean -- ought to be good, and I must admit that I have not studied those with great care, but I would think if we are going to accept these adjectives that we might well have further study by the Career Development Board or somebody - to make sure that we can put out an Agency instruction, and not have separate ones for different components. With that modification I wonder if that would be acceptable to you, Dan?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I would like it to be more specific -- and I think we have to have the four, and I would be against three, but I would like to put in it "wholly satisfactory" as a slight step in the direction of what Dan is saying. In other words, when you give the guy this rating you say: "Your performance is wholly satisfactory" -- which is a little better than satisfactory. I would like that one word in there. I think it makes it just a little better.

COLONEL WHITE: I buy that.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I think the word is "entirely", Von -- either is perfectly acceptable to me -- but I think it would strengthen the connotation--

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I agree -- "entirely satisfactory". I think that makes it better. I think it will keep a few more people in this category by adding that one word.

CHAIRMAN: Any other comments on Section B?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I'm afraid I have one which could be either on B or C, but I'll bring it up on B. In the instructions we are told in Section B to consider all sorts of things -- productivity, decisiveness, cooperativeness, initiative, mobility, records discipline, etc. It seems to me in view of the extreme importance of language competence that if there is not an actual place where this must be rated individually there should be at least a rough reference to it in the instructions. As I recall, a week ago at the Deputies' Meeting the Director was quite interested in pushing language competence and was concerned about how to push the language program. Not only in the DD/P

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

area but in many parts of the DD/I language is an extremely important thing -- and Lord knows, abroad in the DD/P it is sometimes of the very essence. And it seems to me the Fitness Report should be designed to force the supervisor, where appropriate, to state a man's language competence, even though he has passed OTR's tests. The OTR test is a somewhat academic thing. In the case of a DD/P fellow out in the field I would be interested not in his academic knowledge of the language but his ability to use the language as a tool in operations, and I think this might very appropriately be included in the Fitness Report. This is, [REDACTED] about 80% in the DD/P area and 20% in the DD/I.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I certainly am in favor of putting in a place to rate a man on language efficiency if that has anything to do with his job.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] There is nothing on the Form for that.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] But only if it is essential to the job.

COLONEL WHITE: Wouldn't it be better to put it in the instructions rather than on the Form?--because it's not applicable to most of my people, and I think it would be better to put it in the instruction.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] But there are more people to which language applies than records discipline, for example.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] There is another exercise, really, in which we are making an honest effort to record, centrally, the language competence of members of the Clandestine Services -- which is certainly very badly needed -- and that is that we are drawing up lists of requirements for language competence by taking the jobs both in being and planned that require the language, and then having individuals with the other qualifications necessary to perform this job either have or acquire the language. One of the things that is so frequently overlooked is that if a job requires a language capability a man who has the language capability isn't necessarily qualified to do the job - he has to have a lot of other qualifications before he can do it. Therefore one of our troubles with this whole language program has been that people who got an award and who acquired a capability in a language, after they had done it were not usable in the jobs which required this. Therefore we are starting off now with a

**SECRET**

# SECRET

requirement for an individual who has had actual case officer experience, and this sort of thing, and he must have German -- well, then you start off with a man who has this, and if he doesn't have German make him take it. So I believe that these records which we are now certainly going to retain centrally will come a long way toward meeting this requirement that we have without using the Fitness Report.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] But I wonder if they aren't based on having passed the OTR tests.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] This is certainly a determination of whether he has an acceptable degree of proficiency, but it also is to make sure that people are directed to take the language instruction when they are otherwise qualified and don't have it.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I think if this is one of the qualifications of the job it should be rated.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] And I think, therefore, that statement, when it is a necessary part of the job that the man is currently doing -- such as a case officer in Saigon - he should certainly have somewhere in his

25X1A9a

Fitness Report an indication of his proficiency in French.

MR. [REDACTED] I think on previous forms in most cases it has been covered in the narrative.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I think you could do it by adding a sentence--

CHAIRMAN: Under Section C - Narrative Description - add: Comment on foreign language competence if required in current position.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Fine.

CHAIRMAN: It would be a mandatory item.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Very good. I think this is an improvement.

CHAIRMAN: Any other comments on Section B? [No response.]

Now Section C is our narrative description. There is one major change. The old form used to say: stress strengths and weaknesses. I think that is essentially undesirable, because you tend to distort the picture if you stress. So we say: Indicate significant strengths or weaknesses. We do require certain things: state suggestions made for improvement of work performance; give recommendations for training; amplify



**SECRET**

or explain, if appropriate, ratings given in Section B to provide the best basis for determining future personnel action. Manner of performance of managerial or supervisory responsibilities must be described. Comment on foreign language competence if required in current position.

The instructions throw in a sort of checklist, if you will, of things people should have in mind in trying to pick out significant strengths and weaknesses. We can't cover everything in any narrative -- that is obvious -- and if we can induce the supervisor to speak to the more meaningful things, why that is about it.

Are there any criticisms or suggestions on this Section?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] There was one additional comment that came in after this went out, and that was the suggestion of putting in the instructions that "where appropriate" a comment be made on career provisional employees as to whether they appear to be meeting the criteria for selection into the Career Service, so that over a period of three years you build up a record that this had been considered as they were going along. It wouldn't do to put it on the Form itself, because it wouldn't be applicable in most cases, but putting it in the instructions that "where appropriate" - so that when it came time to review the records of people eligible for Career Service membership you would have a basis to go on.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] And you would have three Fitness Reports with that comment.

25X1A9a

CHAIRMAN: It sounds very good to me.

MR. [REDACTED] This is a very minor point, but in this "Overall Performance in Current Position" on the Fitness Report you say: Take into account everything about the employee which influences his effectiveness in his current position. And then you list certain items. It would seem to me that if you want to say take into account everything about the employee which influences his effectiveness you might say: including his performance of specific duties, productivity, conduct on the job -- and so on. This is a very minor thing, but it seemed to me this might be interpreted as everything that you would take into consideration. Well, there might be something that isn't there that would be ever so much more applicable. This

**SECRET**

## SECRET

is at the bottom of the 1st page of the Fitness Report -- "Overall Performance in Current Position."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Maybe we could say "such as" -- because this is what you are really driving at - these are just things to remind you--

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] That is right, these are illustrations. It's mildly inconsistent to say take everything into consideration and then list things -- unless you say "such as"--

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

I think the only other really significant change in the Form is the inclusion in Section D of this little provision for the individual where he indicates if he is attaching his own statement of rebuttal, or what not, on the Form. It has been my personal experience that people have been concerned for years and years and years about bad Fitness Reports they have gotten, and they come in and they want to be reassured that some memo they wrote five years back is still a part of their personnel file, and so on -- and often it never got into their file in the first place. I don't know whether this is worthwhile or not. I don't think very many people will do this.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I think it is extremely worthwhile to have a standing offer that they may do so if they desire.

CHAIRMAN: I see no harm done whatsoever.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I think they should have a standing offer, but I'm for putting it in the instructions and not on the Form.

COLONEL WHITE: It looked a little funny on the Form, to me.

CHAIRMAN: The point is this: the Form stays in the file.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] had a man produce a rebuttal to a Fitness Report that ran 180 pages.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] He should have been selected out, there is no question about it. This would absolutely be prima-facie evidence.

CHAIRMAN: This might produce very good evidence to assist in some selection outs.

COLONEL WHITE: It doesn't make any difference to me.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Interestingly enough, this was the only other

**SECRET**

point where I had unanimous reaction from every office against it.

CHAIRMAN: What were they afraid of?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Just that it wasn't a necessary flag here.

CHAIRMAN: Did they feel it would incite people to refute  
Fitness Reports?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I think some people thought that, and this  
refutation of Fitness Reports is a worthless exercise, anyway, because a  
Fitness Report is a subjective statement of the supervisor's feeling about  
the guy, and you can't refute it -- or most of the time you can't, anyway,  
unless you have production figures, etc.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Couldn't you do the same thing purely within the  
Office of Personnel by arranging some sort of a flag that you could put  
on these things when there was an attached statement?

COLONEL WHITE: I would say if you are going to take it out of  
the Form -- and I would be inclined to take it out -- put something in the  
instruction.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] And say that this statement will become part  
of the individual's record.

CHAIRMAN: And if it doesn't?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] How are you going to check? If the individual has  
checked here under Section D you know that there is a statement, but if  
there is nothing on the Form you would have no way of knowing that.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] These things are quite often done six months later.

CHAIRMAN: If we left it in for a year and saw what happened  
would we be in a better position to judge the pros and cons?

COLONEL WHITE: I don't have any strong feeling about it.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] It's really a little thing.

CHAIRMAN: If we get 10 cases a year I'd be surprised. I hope  
we don't get more than that.

COLONEL WHITE: If the fellow leaves this blank then there is not--

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Not necessarily, because he might want to come in  
with one later, as many of them do.

CHAIRMAN: That is true, but it means he has passed up the

**SECRET**

SECRET

opportunity to make formal note of it.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I'm opposed to anything that expands or adds additional action to this part of the exercise. I think I have already bored you all enough with my ideas on this. But I believe that, as has been pointed out here, very often the rebuttal follows after a considerable interval, and there would be no indication of that on here.

COLONEL WHITE: I think I agree with that. The man has to sign that he has seen the Fitness Report, and he must know that if he wants to fight about it that is up to him.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] But in the past there has been no procedure, actually, for a person to indicate he disagreed.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] But you now have it in the instructions.

COLONEL WHITE: I'd take it out of the Form.

CHAIRMAN: Okay.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I'd rather see some fine print in the line above or below that says, "I certify that I have seen Sections A, B, and C of this Report" -- and this does not necessarily constitute agreement -- because you get all these people who are refusing to sign them -- such as some

25X1A6a

gentlemen out in the [REDACTED] - if they don't get a Fitness Report that they think is high, they won't sign it.

COLONEL WHITE: I think any supervisor confronted with that situation ought to take care of it by simply writing in there: I showed it to Mr. So and So, and he refused to sign it. Because this is a subjective thing. What employee is going to agree with it if he is shown a bad Fitness Report?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] This might be a little drastic but we might consider letting the employee make out his own. This might not be a bad idea.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I'd like to see a provision -- probably in the instruction under Section B -- for another situation. I have seen many Fitness Reports come back from the field: Employee has left this Station -- employee no longer with us. I think it is incumbent upon the next receiving echelon to make sure the employee sees this Fitness Report. And somewhere

SECRET

SECRET

along the line there is a gap in that. I wonder if we couldn't cover it in the instructions?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] That is sort of a procedural matter within say the Office of Personnel, isn't it?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] In the procedure from the field to the geographic branch, and then it's incumbent upon the Personnel Officer of the Division or the Personnel Officer of the Branch to reach the employee. This is not covered in the instructions in the case of a transfer--

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Instructions on how to fill out the form -- not instructions on how to handle the Form.

CHAIRMAN: For the submission of the initial Report and the annual Report the instructions are covered here. I don't understand the situation that you are speaking about.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] This happens a great deal -- they come back from overseas--

COLONEL WHITE: A man has left the Station and his Fitness Report isn't made out until after he has left.

CHAIRMAN: The man hasn't seen it?

COLONEL WHITE: No, because he left before it was made out.

But I would think that if you want to do that it should be in some Regulation, rather than on this form as to how to make it out.

I have to go to another meeting in two minutes, so could I make just one remark? I think that in this last sentence on the back page of the instructions that the Director of Personnel is taking on an almost impossible task, and that is - where there is disagreement between the reviewing officer and the rating officer it is the responsibility of the Director of Personnel to confer with the Head of the Career Service and see whether or not any changes ought to be made. I think you [ ] indicating Mr. Echols [ ] are really taking on a chore for yourself.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I don't think any adjudication is necessary. Let them stand on their own feet. I think it's an extremely useful thing when they disagree, if they are sincerely doing so, and requires no judgment.

SECRET

**SECRET**

COLONEL WHITE: If you want to satisfy this requirement in some way it could be done by saying that if the reviewing officer is in substantial disagreement that he should state whether or not he discussed it with the reviewing official and the employee. But I think you are taking on an impossible chore.

CHAIRMAN: I think it will rarely happen.

COLONEL WHITE: Yes, but there would be a case where the guy appeals and he would call attention to these procedures and say: You didn't do what the instructions said. If you're going to put that monkey on anybody's back put it right back on the reviewing officer at the time he makes his review.

. . . . Colonel White left the meeting . . . .

CHAIRMAN: Well, this is not intended to be a final action submission today, but do you think there is sufficient agreement here for us to rough up some new copies of this thing?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I'm happy.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I'm for it.

MR. [REDACTED]: I have one more suggestion, and I promise it's the last one. And I put this in the form of a question. Might it be useful to have a section in this Fitness Report form where somebody at the top of the component would compare consciously and admittedly the effectiveness and fitness of this individual with his associates and colleagues? I started off by saying: What do we mean when we say a man is average? Does that mean that we are comparing him with others of his grade and function and so on? I find these Fitness Reports are useless, to a large extent, when you start out to rate people in any category, because you find so many that have the same ratings as far as adjectives or numbers or something of that sort is concerned. It occurred to me that if you put a section in here which had to be filled in by an operating official of the employee's Career Service -- this would be a Division Chief or his Deputy, or an Assistant Director -- for example, in the case of GS-9's and up, that we would have him make some comment such as: Taking into account the report

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

of this man's performance in his present position, and considering the entire record of the individual as known to me, I would rank him in the upper third, the middle third -- whatever divisions you want.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] You are adding a second reviewing official?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Not necessarily. Most of our chiefs of the area divisions are the reviewing official -- so he would just do this as the reviewing official.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] This is the reviewing official, then, and not somebody even above him?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] No. But the point is that when you get down to a case officer or an operations officer you would be asking a section chief, for example, to express an opinion about where this man should go, and this would not be particularly useful because his knowledge of comparative performance throughout the Clandestine Services, or even in his own Division, is not very broad -- whereas certainly on the review committees that we established in connection with 701 it was rather surprising, I thought, how many division chiefs knew people who weren't in their divisions but with whom they had served elsewhere, and they were not at all reluctant to say: Well, I think this man, based on what I know, was such and such and such. This helped materially in our reviews. I just raise the question to see whether we believe that there is any practicability in including in this Form an overall rating of this individual up to the present time, or whether we must put together the ranking of his various performances in various jobs.

CHAIRMAN: I myself think this would be a very dangerous thing to do, and I point this out: these Fitness Report evaluations are just one small piece of many evaluative mechanisms that go on day in and day out. For example, every individual has a security evaluation, a medical evaluation -- every time you consider people for assignments somebody is making comparative evaluations. When a Division or Branch or Field Station recommends people for promotion or sends in a list of people in their ranking of preference for promotion they are making comparative evaluations. And all of these things come up to constantly mounting levels, and finally get to your promotion panels and competitive promotion panels -- and not everybody is

**SECRET**

## SECRET

known to everybody, but these comparative evaluations are constantly taking place, and they decide who is in the upper third, or the upper quarter, etc.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] All right -- but if I see anywhere in writing a Division Chief saying about a GS-12 case officer: "This is one of the best operations officers I have ever seen at work -- he worked for me years ago in Saigon, and at that time I would certainly say he was in the upper 10% of the case officers in the Clandestine Services." Now that wouldn't mean that he was still that -- but that really means something to me -- and I don't know whether it's practicable to provide for that sort of thing.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] That means you would have to pass these things around among all your operating officials.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] This might penalize the fellow who just by an accident of geography didn't come to the attention of the fellow in a position to recommend him--

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] How is the fellow who knew the man from Saigon -- how is he going to see this particular Fitness Report?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] You [REDACTED] indicating Mr. [REDACTED] mean at the 25X1A9a time he reviewed this thing.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] He means those he is reviewing.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Yes, that is all I was trying to say.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I think I'm looking at it as a bigger exercise, then, than you meant.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] How about a small station where you have a GS-12 who may very well not be known to the reviewing official if you have a 6-man station, and the Fitness Report is signed by the Chief of Base and sometimes reviewed back here by a Deputy Chief of a Division who is not qualified to state an opinion--

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] No, I was saying those that would come up to the operating officials. This wouldn't be done by the Branch Chief -- this would be done by the Chief of the component or his Deputy.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Often he would be even less than the Branch Chief able to tell what the man performed like in the field.



# SECRET

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Perhaps on this tour, but this is overall performance. I will just withdraw this.

CHAIRMAN: I can appreciate what you are trying to do. It would be a tremendous help to people who review these things who don't know the individual -- they could say, "At least these fellows put him in the upper third."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] My point was a man in a small station - he is rated out there by the Chief of Station, he comes back to the Branch, the Branch reviews it and says: This man has done a very good job indeed in the station. It would go up to the Deputy Chief or the Chief, and the Chief would say: I don't have personal knowledge of this performance but based on previous experience that I have had with this man and what I have had reported to me I would rate him among the top third.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] That is a third man. Then you have added a third man.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Not in every case.

CHAIRMAN: I think it is unmanageable.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I withdraw it.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] By accident a fellow could be penalized because he wasn't lucky enough to catch somebody's eye.

CHAIRMAN: Then if it is agreed we will pull these things together and I think I will fan out a copy for last minute coordination. But aside from that do you generally think we can proceed? [No response.]

I would make one more suggestion. None of you have spoken to the proposed Notice announcing the system, and I would think that in this Notice is where, on the Agency level, the law could be laid down that now is the time to start applying the English language as it was meant to be applied, and apply these definitions as they logically and normally are interpreted, to try to get us off to a good start.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Sounds like a New Year's resolution to me.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] On the other hand, Red seems to have a mechanism for doing what you say -- to hold forth at his Staff Meeting with just that thought in mind.

**SECRET**

CHAIRMAN: Well, it is a command exercise too. I think that would have to be done. I think in the DD/P they are going to have to try to maintain uniformity, and the same way with the DD/I.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] What I would really like to get out of a Fitness Report once or twice is a real feeling for how good or how bad the individual is, and I certainly don't get it, except very rarely.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Don't you get it when you look at a whole string of them? You never get it out of one, but as we grow older in this business and a guy begins to have a dozen or half a dozen different reports, and perhaps from different people, then you begin to get a picture of him.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] You may get a picture but I doubt it is a very realistic one.

CHAIRMAN: I find it very useful. Of course, you always wish you had more--

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] It's not an exact science, to say the least.

CHAIRMAN: There is one other thing I might mention as an interest item. The DD/P submitted to the Director various recommendations for the improvement of the management of the Clandestine Services -- a program of benefits, if you will, for personnel in the Clandestine Services. Among these are early retirement, the definition of the criteria or the factors which will identify people eligible for an early retirement program and possibly other benefits, certain changes in the grade structure in the Clandestine Services -- which don't concern all of us here -- and so on. But there are two items which definitely might affect the Career Council, and they are these: (a) the recommendation that immediate effort be made to get an early retirement program for the Agency; and (b) that we attempt to increase the separation compensation under our surplus exercise to at least equal that of the military services and the Foreign Service.

I don't know what transpired at the Director's level on this, but I'm sure that General Cabell conferred with the Director on this, and as a result I received this package the other day addressed to the Chairman of the CIA Career Council, and the subject is: Agency-wide Early Retirement

**SECRET**

Program. The reference is the memo I referred to submitted by Mr. Bissell to the Director. The text is this: The CIA Career Council is hereby directed to develop an Agency-wide early retirement program without waiting for further developments in connection with the surplus personnel program or possible legislative action on compensation for Federal employees. This is signed by C. P. Cabell, General, Deputy Director.

So as of this moment the Council has a dictum to immediately get to work on the development of an early retirement program. Toward this end, and because I believe that my office has the basic staffing responsibility here, I propose to pull together a little staff of technicians. And I might add, optimistically, that I think that we can develop an early retirement program very quickly -- I think it can be done in a matter of probably not more than three weeks.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] We have done it many times already -- we just haven't used it.

CHAIRMAN: We have always gotten down in the past into some very elaborate and very inconclusive actuarial studies and debates as to how this can be financed - should it be done under the Civil Service retirement system by amendment of the Act, should it be done by incorporation into the Foreign Service retirement system, or by the CIA setting up its own retirement fund. This posed some difficult problems. I think I can come up with an early retirement program complete with a funding mechanism which will sidestep some of these past problems. And I might add that the only reason our program is not further advanced than it is is that it was deliberately shelved in the past.

25X1A9a

I would like to have a little task force set-up, though, that would work on this, and the only members I had in mind immediately were myself and a couple of people from my staff, but I would like to get on it [REDACTED] because of his association with it in the past and his legislative knowledge and know-how, and I don't know who should participate from the DD/I and the DD/P. I think perhaps not on a full-time working basis but when the time comes to intensively tackle the proposal, and so on, I would like everybody to pitch in and do a job on this. At the present

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

instant I am collecting every known bit of literature on the subject of early retirement programs -- the FBI program, the Foreign Service program, congressional hearings, military programs, etc. I thought we could convene this task force and maybe go down to [REDACTED] and spend a few days just reading all that is to be read on the thing and then turning to some variation of these prior programs that might be suitable for CIA, and then come back and do some more staff work, and then maybe have one or two further intensive task force meetings on the subject. I would like your advice as to whether you think this approach is a reasonable one.

25X1A6b

MR. [REDACTED] Will you circulate that package to us, including the reference? This is based on the reference?

25X1A9a

CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think it would have to be circulated -- I should do this. I only point out this: Mr. Bissell's submission here goes into many fields and activities that are only of concern to the Clandestine Services.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I'd like to comment on this, if I may. There is really very little relationship between General Cabell's directive to you and the papers which it covers -- very little relationship.

25X1A9a

CHAIRMAN: Correct - just this one little item.

MR. [REDACTED] When I got a copy of General Cabell's memorandum to you I could scarcely believe it. I didn't believe that it addressed itself to the paper which I prepared for Mr. Bissell and which Mr. Bissell sent to the Director -- because there was no consideration given whatsoever to the possibility of a new pay bill in the Government, nor to the results of [REDACTED] -- we didn't raise that at all. We also addressed ourselves only to the problem in the Clandestine Service. So I had an opportunity to talk with Mr. Bissell about this and he told me that there was a great deal that had occurred in connection with this which was not evident from General Cabell's memorandum -- that at a luncheon he had discussed - and I believe General Cabell was present - the purposes of his paper, that is that the recommendations he had made to the Director and on which the Director would say to you: Go ahead and prepare legislation and so on -- had the sympathetic reaction of the Director, and he felt that we

25X1A

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

should address ourselves to this without delay. And Bissell said that although there was no formal indication here that Mr. Bissell's recommendations, which are very clear -- very clearly, indeed, put forth in there -- had the blessing of the Director -- but certainly you would never know that from General Cabell's memorandum.

CHAIRMAN: You mean the entire paper has the endorsement of the Director?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Yes, I think that certainly it has the endorsement of the Director so far as consideration now by you as Director of Personnel to either comment on or to accept the recommendations of Bissell and proceed to draw up legislation and proceed to do these other things. We gave careful consideration to the procedure of passing this to you [indicating Mr. Echols] before it went to the Director, and therefore have it reach the Director with the comments, the concurrence or opposition of the Director of Personnel. Bissell took the other course because he felt that it was extremely urgent to get this approval in principle from the Director at a very early date in his incumbency -- therefore he proceeded along this line.

What is involved here, really, is to see what your attitude is toward the recommendations which are made, and I think then the Director is going to have to make some further decisions before action can be taken usefully on the very considerable amount of substance that is contained in that paper.

CHAIRMAN: One of Mr. Bissell's recommendations I don't understand or don't know its import. His underlying report which is from his committee seemed to recommend or did recommend the establishment of a special corps, you might say, of individuals - by selection - who would be eligible for the benefits of this retirement program. Mr. Bissell's recommendation made no reference to the establishment of any such a corps, as I interpreted it, but appeared to merely call for the establishment of criteria of eligibility for benefits under such a program.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Bissell accepted the recommendations of the committee.

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

CHAIRMAN: It certainly is not apparent in his recommendation, as I read it.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] He refers in his memorandum, which was a covering one, to the recommendations of the committee, which he says -- and I have forgotten the exact words -- which he supports and refers to the Director for action.

CHAIRMAN: This is going to be a difficult thing to get back on the tracks -- because, for example, as of this moment I am opposed, just for one, opposed to the creation of any foreign service corps in the Agency, and I have no indication that we are to look into this any further or to pursue it any further. You seem to think that we should.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] From what Bissell said to me about his conversation with the Director, and this is a difficult thing to support because there is absolutely no reference to it in here whatsoever - General Cabell might just as well have been writing on an entirely different subject in this brief memorandum.

CHAIRMAN: I would almost suggest that you or I go back to Mr. Bissell and point out that there appears to be a void here - a misunderstanding.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Bissell said there isn't any void. He said this was agreed verbally that the Director would now refer this to the people who would have to take the action - for comments, for concurrence.

CHAIRMAN: Well, I can take it up at the other end of the ladder and find out what happened to the balance of this thing. Okay, fine.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] The thing is completely off the trolley. Something has to be done.

CHAIRMAN: Because, among other things, if I were to develop an early retirement program based upon or geared to the establishment of a foreign officers' corps, this might take months or years, but to establish a retirement program based upon certain conditions of service which have been fulfilled, this can be done prospectively, and you can do it in short order.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] What chance do you think you have of getting

**SECRET**

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~~~SECRET~~

early retirement for an individual whose function is not dissimilar to the function performed in the Department of Agriculture?

CHAIRMAN: We have no chance--

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Then should it be Agency-wide?

CHAIRMAN: But I don't think you have to establish a corps of officers in order to determine who should be eligible or not. It would be much more appropriate within the structure of this Agency to establish the conditions of service which if endured by an individual--

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Then your next move is for you to come back and say: I have carefully considered this paper and this is my attitude toward it.

CHAIRMAN: I have already done so, in writing, to Colonel White -- somewhere in this exercise -- but where all of this is, I don't know. I will have to explore more thoroughly what happened to the balance of this recommendation -- what is the status of it.

Well, this was an information item.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Somewhere in the Regulation there is something that says the Inspector General is to advise the Personnel Director on the utilization of manpower. I wonder if that has ever gone--

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Isn't it a normal staff process that a Deputy Director who is in the line of command can make certain recommendations of very wide and sweeping importance to his Boss, the Director?

CHAIRMAN: I don't know why not.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] And ask for his approval? The Director has a staff which is quite apart from the Deputy Director. The normal procedure, if I know anything about it, is for him to refer these recommendations to his staff and ask for comments. The staff people who are asked to comment are people who have a responsibility to the Director on the subjects which are covered in the recommendations. This is where we are at.

CHAIRMAN: You are quite right, and this has been done -- truthfully, it has been done. General Cabell has obtained at least indirectly my views on this, Colonel White's views on this, Larry Houston's views on this. In other words, he has referred it to his staff and has gotten their collective views -- which somehow have disappeared out of the entire exercise.

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~~~SECRET~~

Now I have to go back to General Cabell--

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Then isn't the next step for the Boss to match the recommendations against your views and make a decision?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] May I ask one quick question. Are we doing anything new toward getting Civil Service status for our people? This has come up with many of these people that are now being declared surplus.

CHAIRMAN: We are not doing anything new. We have been working perhaps toward this for some time. The decisions not to pursue the seeking of agreement were deliberate ones, wilful ones, and we postponed any further exploration for very good and sound reasons. The question has come up recently in conjunction with our separation of surplus personnel exercise. I believe we should again re-open preliminary studies with the Civil Service Commission. But there are grievous pitfalls here. The basic requirement, which we already know about, is that we have to convince the Civil Service Commission that we are operating a competitive merit system at least roughly equivalent to that of the normal competitive service. This means we have to be particularly comparable in our recruitment procedures, in our selection procedures, in our assignment procedures, in our promotion procedures, our advancement procedures, and in, I fear, our separation procedures. Now just how close we have to come and whether in so doing we will strip ourselves of much of our flexibility in recruitment, selection, assignment, etc., I don't know. And this is something we have to move into very carefully or the first thing you know we would wipe the Director's special authority off the books by agreement with the Civil Service Commission.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I'm not proposing it -- I'm just asking whether you are doing it.

CHAIRMAN: And I think our regulations and our personnel concepts have now solidified to the point where we can sit down with our regulations -- they have to study with us our regulations and our system of personnel management -- but then to decide whether we are sufficiently compatible, morally and otherwise, to make an agreement acceptable. But we have to be

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~



CONFIDENTIAL

~~SECRET~~

25X1A

pretty careful. We didn't even know until our [redacted] exercise that we were in fact exempt from the Veterans' Preference Act -- we thought we were and we adopted that posture, but now we have official rulings on it.

25X1A9a

MR. [redacted] But if you get Civil Service status, we won't be exempt from it for very long.

CHAIRMAN: We don't get status. By an exchange agreement they agree when our people leave us, and we let them go, that they will treat them as if they did have status.

. . . . The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m. . . . .

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL